MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF THE HARTFORD DISTRIBUTORS TRAGEDY

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise on a very solemn and sad moment to express condolences to families of the victims within my congressional district in the State of Connecticut.

I have always empathized with my fellow colleagues when they address the House about fateful events that occur in their communities. I just never imagined that tragedy would strike so close to home. And it's hard to conceive, I know for everyone here, that bad things happen to good people.

On the morning of August 3, 2010, eight men went to work, some looking forward to vacation, others nearing retirement, none expecting the calamity that would follow. I thank my colleagues for indulging me the time to express the heartfelt condolences of the Nation and this body. Eight men went to work that morning. Some of them followed in the footsteps of their fathers and brothers before them. This is a family business, many of whom had served and worked at this family business for over 20 years. Neither they nor their families and friends could anticipate the senseless, unthinkable actions that occurred on that morning. Yet bad things happen to good people.

So consequently, ordinary people are going through extraordinary circumstances, punctuated by acts of heroism, courage, and camaraderie that unites them. These eight men, Bill Ackerman of East Windsor, Bryan Cirigliano of Newington, Francis Fazio of Bristol, Louis Felder of Stamford, Victor James of Windsor, Edwin Kennison of East Hartford, Craig Pepin of South Windsor, and Douglas Scruton of Manchester, lost their lives that day.

They were Teamsters of Local 1035. But beyond that, they were husbands, fathers, grandfathers, coaches, and friends. They were leaders and stalwarts in their communities where they lived and served. All were part of a family business, which makes this so tragic, a family that's operated a business since 1955. The owner of that business I was with that fateful morning. Stunned and shocked, as everyone was, his thoughts were only about the safety and well-being of his workforce, his concern as to whether or not they would be able to keep their wages. And he talked to the comptroller, making sure that benefits would be extended. And his heart went out to all of the families who were victims of this senseless, tragic slaying.

It's a family business. It was a tragic and horrific thing that took place in Manchester, Connecticut. What the people of Hartford Distributors have, as they went through this, and the several vigils and memorials that have been created, and the funeral services that are still going on, is they understand that they have one another. And they intend, later this week, to lock arms and march back into the warehouse together, and continue to move forward, always remembering those eight men.

I ask that the Members rise and observe a moment of silence in memory of these eight men and their families during this senseless tragedy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is aware of valid bases for the gentleman's point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RANGEL. My dear friends and colleagues, I rise to the floor because the newspapers and the media have indicated that there is a concern about some of the Members in this House that I retire or remove myself from this body. And I have always tried to play by the rules. And I cannot think of anybody that has encouraged me to speak here.

I want to thank all of you who are concerned about me for saying that, you know, a guy's a fool to represent himself, as some of the people have said. But I have been losing a lot of sleep over these allegations, and my family and community. And some of these rules that they have is that I am restricted by confidentiality. But for years I have been saying, No comment, no comment, no comment to a lot of serious allegations because I could not comment, and I would refer them to the Ethics Committee.

When the Ethics Committee finally brought out their statement of alleged violations, it was a long list of things, and somehow the chairman of the subcommittee of investigation indicated that I had received a lot of offers to settle this thing so that it would not cause embarrassment to my Democratic friends, and that I had been offered a reprimand. And a lot of people kind of felt that that sounded like a wonderful opportunity to remove this so that I could leave the Congress with some degree of dignity.

Why, even some people said that the President had suggested that his life might be made easier if there was no CHARLIE RANGEL so-called scandal. But I interpret it another way. I think when the President said that he wanted me to end my career in dignity, he didn't put a time limit on it. And I would think that his concern would be that if any Member of the House of Representatives has been accused of serious crimes or allegations, that somehow within the process, even though we are not entitled to a court process, there has to be some process in which the Member has an opportunity to tell his constituents, his family, and his friends what he didn't believe.

So when the chairman of the investigative committee said I had been offered a settlement, it reminded me of something that I will devote my retiring years to besides education, which is the major thrust of my attempt here, is that those of you that come anywhere near criminal courts, we have a terrible thing that happens throughout these United States. And that is that someone gets arrested for a very serious crime, and they get their lawyer, and the lawyer explains that, I think it's better that you plead guilty to a lesser crime. And he says, Well, I am not only not guilty, but I don't even know what's involved here. They said, Well, listen, we are not suggesting that you plead guilty if you are innocent, but we think you ought to know that this judge, if you are found guilty, is going to send you away for 20 years. On the other hand, you have no offenses, you are a first offender, and if you could just forget about this thing and explain later what happened.

□ 1250

So he continues to tell his lawyer that, hey, I am willing to admit what I have done wrong, and I have done some things wrong, but I shouldn't have to anyway. He says, listen, we would never tell you to quit or resign. We are just telling you that it would be easier for us if this were not an issue. But knowing the President as I do, I think he believes that dignity means that everybody is entitled to be judged for allegations against them.

Now, what is working against me? We come back to this House because the Speaker has called us here in order to make certain that we provide resources for governors and mayors to maintain our teachers and our firefighters, and RANGEL is not on the schedule for anything. Which is okay, because I know that the members of the committee, they work hard, it is a selfless job. God knows I wouldn't take it. I respect the time that they have placed on this. And it has been almost 2 years.

But I have a primary that takes place a couple of days before they even thought about meeting. And then I found out from my lawyer that even when they meet on the 13th of September, there is no trial date for then.

So I don't want to be awkward and embarrass anybody. As a matter of fact, those people that believe that their election is going to be dependent on me resigning, I would like to encourage Democrats to believe, I think Republicans have given you enough reason to get reelected, and they continue to do something.

But quite frankly, I think I have given. I mean, a lot of people don't know, but when the—well, I don't want to be critical of the Ethics Committee because my lawyer said you can't get

annoyed with them because there still may be room for settlement. And I thought about it.

Well, when I found out that one of the Republicans that will be sitting on what they call the adjudication committee had made remarks condemning me for my contribution to City College, that it was a RANGEL thing, an ego thing and a corrupt thing, and he was going to judge me, I asked my lawyer, I said, well, how can they do that? They said well, the Ethics Committee can do what they want.

I said, well, do me a favor. I have paid close to $2 million. I continue to owe you money. And you are telling me that you have no idea when there is going to be a hearing, and every time I talk with you there are six or seven lawyers. I said, do me a favor. I said Friday, let's see what happens today in terms of reaching out to settle this thing, because I can't afford to be represented by counsel.

Each and every day the expenses build up, and I think that I have an obligation to younger Members of Congress to be able to tell them if you couldn't raise the $2 million, you are out of business, no matter what the allegations are, because no one is going to read the defense. And, of course, just the allegations by themselves with Members who have close districts, Republicans and Democrats, they would be out of business. So I am here because I could afford lawyers for close to 2 years, but everyone would know that there comes a limit.

So I told them, just put everything on hold. See what happens when we meet here. And, guess what? Nothing happened. There is no agenda. So what they are saying is that, well, the Ethics Committee will be leaving for Members to be able to work in their districts and to get reelected, and I am having a primary that I have to wait until after my primary to find out when the Ethics Committee intends to have a hearing. And then that hearing comes just before, maybe, the general election.

There must be something wrong with the rules, because people would advise me that I can only hurt myself by coming before this committee. Nobody has tried to protect the integrity of the Congress with 2 years, almost 2 years of investigation. They said the mistakes that RANGEL has made should be public, and it should have been public earlier than now. And I couldn't say anything because I didn't want to offend and don't want to offend the Ethics Committee. But the Ethics Committee won't even tell me when I am going to have a hearing.

And, heck, people who are concerned about me, I am 80 years old. I don't want to die before the hearing. And I think my electorate are entitled to find out who their Congressman for 40 years is. Who am I? Am I corrupt? Did I get a nickel? What did they offer me. And I want to be a role model for new Members and tell them the mistakes I made so they don't make them.

So they list foundations that specialize in providing funds for education for kids. So I am convinced that the President wants some dignity in knowing that not only am I one of his strongest supporters, but I know that you know that unless we are able to provide education for every child that is there, almost by any means possible, that our Nation's national security is being threatened by foreigners, our ability to be ahead of the curve in terms of trade. And nobody is more supportive of the President in trade. Clear up some of the things in the Korean bill so you don't hurt us. Clean up a little corruption and violence in Colombia and move on with the thing. So the whole idea is really me trying to have some dignity in making certain that America is stronger.

Now, the thing is that in the haste of sending out hundreds of letters, never asking for a penny, but still suggesting I wish you would meet with these people, because I knew that I would hope that they would convince them to provide money. Now, a lot of people have done that. That doesn't mean it is right. But the rules have changed. So there has to be a penalty for grabbing the wrong stationery and not really doing the right thing.

But it is not corrupt. It may be stupid, it may be negligent, but it is not corrupt. And there is no indication that any sworn committee would say I received a benefit.

Some might say that the benefit was that you have a legacy with your name up there. Well, I wish you would go to my Web site to take a look at my answers. This is a broken-down building that you have to run away from if someone is going to put your name on it. But it is still there.

Then they say that I would receive a luxurious office. The sworn testimony was they never told me they were giving it to me. Who the heck needs an office with 40 years of service in the Congress in a broken down building? Then they said, hey, we didn't ask him. We just put it in there so that we encourage people to put it in there. They said the name they thought was not a benefit for me, but a benefit in order to get money.

So I can't imagine why, in the course of all of these things, that I used government personnel, I didn't buy stamps—well, if you think that it is official and you are wrong, then I violated the franking benefits.

And at the end of the day, the inferences are very serious, and mistakes can be made and these things shouldn't have happened. But I can't walk away and have you guys doing your campaign because I am annoying, and the action is out there calling me corrupt.

And no one is coming forward saying RANGEL is not corrupt. RANGEL didn't make a nickel. No witness ever said there was preferential treatment given. And the one guy that had an issue before the Senate, staff, Republicans, everybody said it never came before the House but they keep putting it down there. And guess what? It was the district attorney of New York over 40 years that suggested that I meet with him because he was in the education philanthropic business, in addition to having business in the Senate, which Republicans and Democrats say never came to the Ways and Means Committee, and staff certainly can prove it.

□ 1300

I don't know how far to go with making a mistake and trying to help kids, but you have to be very careful, new Members, of making certain when they change the rules that you know what happens. And I'm prepared to say I'm sorry for any embarrassment that has caused.

Another issue has to do with having an office, a congressional office, in the building that I live in. Now, forever people have said that I have taken advantage and had four rent-controlled, stabilized apartments. Nobody has said that the Ethics Committee never found four stabilized apartments. No one said I broke any laws. No one said that the apartment that they considered two had always been considered one at the least. No one said that 10 years ago there was an apartment, one-bedroom apartment, that I got for my family, for my political friends that I no longer have. But the concern was, well, how do you explain the congressional office?

Well, let's read the landlord's testimony. He said he was 20 percent vacant, that he needed money, that he knew that the checks were paid by the congressional committee, that the mail came in there ''Rangel for Congress,'' and that the lawyers have told him and the officials of the city and State of New York that there was no violation of any law or rules.

And what was the benefit? The benefit was that your colleague and friend was not sensitive to the fact that there was appearance as though I was being treated differently than anyone else. But the landlord said he didn't treat me any differently, no one said that they did treat me differently, but I have to admit that I wasn't sensitive to anything because I never felt then that I was treated any differently than anybody else. And so that ends the apartment thing, but I plead guilty of not being sensitive.

Now when it comes to the negligence of the disclosures and the tax issues, there is absolutely no excuse that's there. When accusations were made, I hired a forensics accountant and told them to check out what the heck is going on, because I want to make certain that when I stand up and speak, that it's true.

Well, after I found out it was far more serious than the accusations, I then referred it to the Ethics Committee. It wasn't as though someone tracked me down, the IRS or the Clerk of the House. I filed the correct papers.

And the taxes that were paid, an accountant might say that, had my accountant recognized that this $32,000 down payment for a house in the Dominican Republic that was promised to be paid for in 7 years would be a complete failure, and if indeed they did not give me one nickel, but whenever they thought they were making a dollar or two, they reduced the mortgage, then there is no question—you don't have to be a tax expert to know that if you didn't report that income, notwithstanding the fact that if you had done the right thing you would have no liability because the taxes that were paid to the Dominican Republic would have been deducted and with depreciation I would have no liability.

Having said that, is that an excuse that is worthy? Of course not. And the fact that there was negligence on the part of the person that for 20 years did it and the fact that I signed it does not really give an excuse as to why I should not apologize to this body for not paying the attention to it that I should have paid to it. But there is not one scintilla bit of evidence that the negligence involved in the disclosures, that there was some way to hide from the public what I had because the value of the property, they would say, was $25,000, $100,000, $200,000—whatever it would be—that it didn't make any sense that I was trying to disclose it.

So why did I take the floor today when I haven't found one lawyer that said I should do it, I haven't even found one friend that said I should do it, but I thought about it. If the lawyers are going to continue to charge me—and I don't even know when the hearing is going to be, and I can't tell them I want one and not six lawyers—I don't want to offend the Ethics Committee. They're doing the best they can.

But I'm in the position that, hey, I'm 80 years old. All my life has been, from the beginning, public service. That's all I've ever done, been in the Army, been a State legislator, been a Federal prosecutor, 40 years here. And all I'm saying is that if it is the judgment of people here, for whatever reason, that I resign, then, heck, have the Ethics Committee expedite this. Don't leave me swinging in the wind until November.

If this is an emergency—and I think it is to help our local and State governments out—what about me? I don't want anyone to feel embarrassed, awkward. Hey, if I was you, I may want me to go away, too. I am not going away. I am here.

I'm not saying there is any partisanship in this. Because if I knew of all the people that have been accused of accusations, I'm in a close district and they were Republicans, I would give a couple of moments of thought to see whether or not—especially if I didn't have anything to work with to get reelected—I would say, hey, take a look at these Republicans. They've been accused.

But I don't really think that the unfairness of this is to me. I don't take it personally. I'm thinking about all of you.

If the President wants dignity, let's have dignity in this House where the Ethics Committee means something and that none of you, if the newspapers say anything, will have to wait 2 years before you can say ''no comment.''

And, in addition to that, once they make the accusations, they have no business making any mistakes in saying that I didn't cooperate. I've got papers with my signature on it. I've got papers that said I tried my darnedest. I've got papers where my lawyer tells me she had every reason to believe that the full committee would sign on there. There was space for people to sign. I'm the only one signing. I don't know what changed their minds about settling this case.

But my lawyer says, don't offend them. My friends say, don't go to the floor. And I say, what are you going to do me? Suppose I do get emotional, suppose I do think of my life, the beginning and the end, are you going to expel me from this body? Are you going to say that, while there is no evidence that I took a nickel, asked for a nickel, that there is no sworn testimony, no conflict, that I have to leave here?

As much as I love you Democrats that figure it would be easier for you, I'm the guy that was raising money in Republican districts to get you here, but that doesn't mean that I criticize you for saying, hey, that's great then, but I'm running for reelection now. I mean, do what you have to do.

And, Republicans, hey, you don't have much to run on, but, what the hell, if RANGEL is an embarrassment based on newspaper articles, I can see why you would do it.

But think. Think. Isn't this historically the first time that it appears as though partisanship has entered the Ethics Committee? Isn't it historically the first time that the recommendations of the subcommittee of investigation is turned down? And, darn, who in the heck would want somebody who politically called you ''corrupt'' to be the ranking bipartisan guy to judge you?

Now I don't expect answers today, and I know you're going home, and I wish all of you well. But at the end of the day, somebody, somebody has to do more than wish I go away. Somebody has to tell me, when does RANGEL get a chance to talk to witnesses? I haven't talked with any member of the Ethics Committee in terms of settlement. My lawyers have.

□ 1310

I haven't talked with any of the witnesses. And they had to expedite this case. In other words, I have a shorter time to prepare, for reasons that they tell me, don't challenge the Ethics Committee; they make up this stuff as they go along.

My lawyer, I can understand how financially this thing can go on longer than I can afford. But she is willing to assist me in working out something in pro bono, and I will expect the leadership to help me.

Don't let this happen to you. Don't walk away from here because it is convenient that I disappear because not all of you will be able to withstand it, as I have. If there is no issue of corruption, if everybody, including the leader over here, has to start off with what a great American I am before he drops the bomb, well, I think that should count for something. And I am not asking for leniency. I am asking for exposure of the facts. They have made a decision. I want you to make a decision.

Now, I apologize to the leadership. I feel for those people, especially newcomers that love this place so much that, like someone said: CHARLIE, they all love you. And I paused, and so they finished with: But they love themselves better. I understand that, you know. But for God's sake, just don't believe that I don't have feelings, that I don't have pride, that I do want the dignity that the President has said. And the dignity is that even if you see fit to cause me not to be able to come back, because you are not going to do it in my district, but if there is some recommendation that I be expelled, for me, for me, that would be dignity because it shows openly that this system isn't working for me. And I hope some of you might think, if it doesn't work for me, that it may not work for you.

So I know we are anxious to get home. I know I can't get on the agenda. I know that some time somewhere I will have a hearing. So while you are saying I should resign, I do hope that you might think about what happens if the whole country starts thinking it is better that you resign and don't make anyone feel uncomfortable than to have the truth, at least a person an opportunity to say you have made alleged violations. I'm saying you are wrong based on sworn testimony. And I want somebody, and I don't think it is going to be people who have been critical of me for doing the same thing that is going to be the judge.

I know outside doesn't count because we judge the conduct of our own Members. Adam Powell knew that when they wouldn't let him be seated; and the courts, of course, overruled it. But if I can't get my dignity back here, then fire your best shot in getting rid of me through expulsion.

Now I apologize for any embarrassment that I have caused. I'm prepared to admit, and try to let young people know that you never get too big to recognize that these rules are for junior Members, as they are for senior Members, and that you can't get so carried away with good intentions that you break the rules because the rules are there to make certain that we have some order, some discipline and respect for the rules.

And I violated that, and I am apologizing for it. And I don't think apologies mean that this is a light matter. It is very serious.

But corruption? No evidence, no suggestion that this was ever found. And

lastly, I close by saying that there is an organization that some of you know, certainly DCCC, National Truth in Government, and whatever, and the only thing I can say that some of my more important Democrats are on the list that sent out mail soliciting money in order to get rid of me even before I became the chairman. They have a Web site that I will be giving you because they got a lot of our Members, including Black Caucus members on their list. One I do remember is send your money in now, we've got Rangel against the ropes and we're going to get rid of him. Everyone knows who they are. They followed me on vacation. They followed me when I was doing business. They're at the airport. They're outside where I live. It is kind of rough.

I'm sensitive to your feelings and the hard work by the Ethics Committee, but this has to stop some time. It has to stop. One month; 1 year; 2 years; primaries; election. And all I'm saying is I deserve and demand the right to be heard. And if I hurt anybody's feelings, believe me, it is the equity and the fairness and the justice that I'm asking for, and not your feelings. We are entitled to our political feelings and what we want done. But we have to respect each other and this institution which I love. I love my country. I love my Congress. And there is nothing I wouldn't do to preserve this from going on. I love the disagreements. I love the debates. I love the arguments. But you are not going to tell me to resign to make you feel comfortable.

So to all of those who tried to help me to help myself, let me appreciate it. And for those who disagree, I'm sorry, but that is one thing you can't take away from me. So thank you for listening. I do hope that you have a pleasant time while you are away. And maybe, just maybe, the members of the Ethics Committee might think about telling me when they think they might have a hearing so that whatever they decide, I can let my constituents, my family, and my friends know that I did the best I could as an American, as a patriot, and someone that loves this country.

Thank you for your attention. Go home.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1606, by the yeas and nays; adoption of House Resolution 1606, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1586, EDUCATION JOBS AND MEDICAID ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1606, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 164, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

YEAS—244

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—164

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Djou
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

NOT VOTING—24

Berry
Blunt
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
DeGette
Diaz-Balart, L.
Gingrey (GA)
Jones
LaTourette
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Meek (FL)
Miller, Gary
Neugebauer
Radanovich
Rooney
Roskam
Snyder
Speier
Tanner
Wamp
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1337

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.